DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 246 RC 011 673

AUTHOR de Ortego y Gasca, Felipe
TITLE Chicanos and Concepts of Culture.
PUB DATE Oct 78
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at a conference sponsored by the Intercultural Development and Research Association (Brownsville, TX, October 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Science Research; *Cross Cultural Studies; *Cultural Differences; Cultural Factors; Cultural Traits; *Culture; Ethnic Studies; *Mexican Americans; Mexicans; *Research Methodology; Research Needs; *Research Problems; Social Factors; Social Science Research; Spanish Speaking
IDENTIFIERS *Chicanos; Hispanos

ABSTRACT

The Chicano culture has been ill-treated and misunderstood in studies that utilize concepts of culture derived from dominant group values and norms. Historical approaches to the study of cultures like the normative approach, taxonomic concept, componential concept, and existential approach have all had impacts upon concepts of Chicano culture. When utilizing the normative approach, for example, non-Chicano analysts and researchers have set up normative sets of ideal and operational behaviors that hardly reflect the actualities of Chicano thought and action; thus, they have begun their studies from an already biased position. Basic propositions from the foundations of culture (e.g., cultural determinism, assimilation-integration-acculturation, bilingualism/biculturalism, cultural syncretism) also have implications for Chicanos. The patterns of culture used by Anglo researchers to define Chicanos have been misinterpreted at best, spurious at worst, and already existing stereotypes have been further reinforced. The general tendency has been to regard Chicanos as Mexicans in the United States and carriers of the Mexican culture. This is erroneous, for the Chicano culture is an intermeshing of Anglo-American and Mexican elements. To define Chicano culture, a Chicano perspective is needed. (Author/DS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Presented at a conference sponsored by the Intercultural Development and Research Association and held at Texas Southmost College, Brownsville, October 1978.

JUL 30 1979

OCT 1979
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

ED178246

CHICANOS AND CONCEPTS OF CULTURE

By Philip Ortego y Gasca

INTRODUCTION

Group behavior conceptualized as "culture" is of relatively recent origin. In fact, the concept of culture evolved from the assumptions of social theory promulgated in the 19th century. Behavior previously assumed to be biological in nature or subsumed under the rubric of "human nature" came to be seen as cultural in essence, socially learned and socially transmitted. In 1871, E. B. Tyler postulated the first scientific definition of culture by identifying it as "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, custom, and many other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society."[1] This view was expanded by Durkheim, Krocher, Towle, Wessler, and many others. By 1921 culture came to be regarded as the systematic body of learned behavior which is transmitted from parents to children. More recently, culture has come to be regarded as a continuum,[2] a flow of characteristics

---

[1]Edward B. Tyler, Primitive Culture (Boston, 1871), quoted in A Behaviorial Approach to Historical Analysis by Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr. (New York: Free Press, 1969), p. 84.

[2]Leslie White, The Science of Culture (New York: Grove Press, 1949), p. xviii.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Philip de Ortego y Gasca

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RC011673

binding one generation to another. However, this perspective advances the deterministic notion that the behavior of human beings is thus conditioned by the culture into which they are born and which both embraces and possesses them totally.[3]

Therefore, the differences in behavior manifested by various groups may be in large part due to differences in their respective cultural traditions. But if our behavior is conditioned totally by our culture, then are we consequently victims of our culture? Or does the problem of cultural contact and so-called "cultural superiority" stem simply from lack of cultural awareness --that is, awareness of the value and centrality of culture in the lives of those who comprise that culture? Indeed the latter is more likely the case, although simply becoming culturally aware of other ethnic groups in and of itself is no guarantee of an oppressed culture's amelioration in the scheme of a dominant culture. The Roman occupation of Greece is a good case in point. For while the Romans, culturally aware of their Greek subjugates, adopted a remarkable array of Greek customs, behavior, conventions, and thought, they nevertheless continued to oppress the Greeks themselves to the point of ferrying them to Rome as slaves. This same kind of

---

[3]Ibid., p. 126.

behavior is evident in the United States vis-à-vis Blacks and Asians and the territorial minorities: Chicanos and Indians. Anglos, for example, readily wear Indian jewelry but keep Indians at arms-length in the social structure; they devour Mexican food but deny Chicanos access into the mainstream; they burn incense but shun the company of Asian-Americans; they dig soul music but continue to depredate Blacks. In all of this the concept of culture is lost in the din of Faustian America.

Yet, if Americans really took the concept of "cultureity"[4] serious, the racial problems of the United States might well be improved, if not eradicated. Let us then examine briefly some relevant concepts in the study of culture and how they relate to Chicanos specifically--and other ethnic minorities in general.

RELEVANT CONCEPTS IN THE STUDY OF CULTURE

NORMATIVE APPROACH

The most pervasive yet the most fallacious notion of culture lies embedded in what has come to be called the "normative" approach to culture. In social analysis

---

[4]That the United States is the sum total of its ethnic parts.

the normative approach to the study of culture directs its attention to that ideation shared by a particular group in terms of what it ought to do. The approach divides such cultural ideation into values and norms. The problem in this approach is that it runs aground over the question of "rhetoric" and "reality." For invariably the normativist encounters the discrepancy between how culture ought to behave and how in fact it does behave. For instance, the rhetoric of the American constitution bestows certain rights and guarantees to all American citizens. Yet, the reality of American life belies the rhetoric of that document. For despite the 14th amendment and the host of Civil Rights laws passed since the Civil War, American Blacks have still to realize the perquisites of American citizenship. And in the march towards acquisition of rights the Constitution has declared they had all along, American Blacks are being chastened for progressing too quickly towards those goals of equality--goals they should not have to strive for if the rhetoric of the Constitution means what it actually says.

Normative analysts of culture explain that there are "ideal" values and norms and "operational" values and norms and that a culture ought to be assessed both

in terms of the ideal and the operational. But the question looms grimly in the nether light of intent and action: Who shall determine what is "ideal" and what is "operational"? Let us look at Chicanos in this light.

First of all, the ideals formulated for thought and action by Chicanos have, for the most part, been the product of non-Chicano analysts and researchers. The result has been a normative set of ideal and operational behaviors which hardly reflect the actualities of Chicano thought and action. A case in point is the cultural grid postulated by such Anglo investigators as Florence Kluckhohn, William Madsen, Celia Heller, and Arthur Rubel, to name but a few. The grid includes notions such as: Chicanos are fatalists. They are not goal-oriented. Nor are they future oriented. By comparison Anglos emerge as exhibiting "right" behaviors while Chicanos appear as exhibiting "deficient" behaviors. Yet, by a criteria derived intraculturally, Chicanos exhibit behaviors in these areas not unlike Anglos. Why the difference then? The answer is simply that Anglo reserachers approach the study of Chicano culture from an already biased position, however much they may disclaim bias. The truth of the matter may

lie in the proposition that an "outsider" cannot hope to really understand a culture unless he is a part of that culture, for cultural nuances may escape his attention entirely, not to mention the subtle and intricate nuances of language engendered by that culture. For example, the Soviet Union declares as fervidly as the United States that it practices popular democracy. Yet Americans regard the rule of the Soviet Union as totalitarian. And likewise, the Soviet Union regards American rule as oppressive. Which is right? We can only respond that the question of "right" lies entirely in the cultural point of view. The normative approach to culture thus limits our perception of a people. Perhaps the most blistering rejoinders to the normative approach in the study of culture comes from Octavio Romano and Nick Vaca.[5] As "insiders" they take to task Anglo researchers who have looked only for the queer, the curious and the quaint about Chicano culture. They argue for a genuine reassessment of Chicano culture in terms of Chicano ideation, not necessarily based on ideal or operational values

---

[5]Octavio Romano, "The Anthropology and Sociology of the Mexican-American: The Distortion of Mexican-American History," El Grito, Fall, 1968; Nick Vaca, "The Mexican-American in the Social Sciences: 1912-1970, El Grito, Spring, 1970.

but based on historical and existential realities as actually experienced by Chicanos, not as perceived by Anglos.

TAXONOMIC CONCEPT

A more current approach to the study of culture is the "taxonomic" in which cultural phenomena is studied by classifying them according to form and function which are then grouped into categories of behavior, categories which Clyde Kluckhohn called "salient categories." Like the normative approach, the taxonomic focuses on behavior perceived externally from the culture under observation, although the classification of cultural experiences attempts to temper judgments about "right" or "deficient" behaviors. Yet the purpose of any concept of culture is to tell us something about the "actors" in question. This predicates interpretation. For without interpretation the data becomes merely a catalog of cultural events or manifestations. Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., identifies the process of interpretation as a problem of "translation." He asks: "To what extent does the observer's construct of a whole culture have reference to some reality in the actors being studied?"[6] Impinging upon interpretation or translation

[6]Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., Op. Cit., p. 120.

of the observed phenomena is the risk of distortion, as Octavio Romano has trenchantly pointed out in his essay on the "Historical and Intellectual Presence of Mexican-Americans."[7] Another problem, of course, with the taxonomic concept of culture is that like its normative kin, it too is rooted in the belief system(s) of the observer(s) rather than on the belief system(s) of the culture under study. The normative concept employs a "prescriptive" criteria while the taxonomic employs a "subjective" one. In short, the central question is as Berkhofer suggests: "To what extent does the observer's [concept of culture] correspond to the actor's cultural ideation said to be the source of the observed behavior?"[8]

COMPONENTIAL CONCEPT

Another concept of culture widely held today is the componential concept that attempts to show how the components--knowledge, belief, values, norms--of a given culture relate to the whole of that culture. This concept suggests that synergically the whole of a culture

---

[7]Octavio Romano, "The Historical and Intellectual Presence of Mexican-Americans," El Grito, Winter, 1969.

[8]Berkhofer, Op. Cit., p. 133.

is greater than its parts. That is, "that no cataloged enumeration of parts is sufficient to represent the true sum total of a culture."[9] Or as Ruth Benedict suggests, "Cultures are more than the sum of their traits."[10] Thus a culture emerges as a configuration or Gestalt of componential values ranked hierarchically. The end judgment of this concept considers culture as a system integrated hierarchically on basic value orientations. A cultural tradition is thus "a stream of interacting cultural elements."[11]

The single most important caution to be heeded in this concept of culture is of course the tendency to view culture mechanistically as a rigid and inflexible structure. The end result of the componential concept of culture is "diagnosis" in terms of fixed restraints such as language and environment, performance (activities), and aspirations (goals). The legitimacy of a culture is thus subjected to various comparisons with other cultures. The success of a culture is therefore its measure of performance against the backdrop of fixed

---

[9] Ibid., p. 142.

[10] Ruth Benedict, Patterns of Culture (New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1934), p. 47.

[11] White, Op. Cit., p. 166.

restraints. For Chicanos this may well mean that an "inefficient" use of language, for example, requires remediation in the form of compensatory learning. Thus, the onus for "improvement" lies with Chicano culture not the social institution of the dominant society.

Componentially, as seen from the Anglo point of view, Chicano culture provides Chicanos with the cultural wherewithal to perform and succeed in Anglo culture if all the components of Chicano culture are functioning effectively. In this case "effectively" means functioning in sub-dominant harmony with the values and norms of the majority society. For Anglos the failure of Chicano culture lies in those things outside of Chicano culture which have not been appropriately integrated. English-language dominance, for example. But the componential concept of culture has some merit for Chicanos provided that diagnosis is not the objective. For indeed, a culture functions componentially for the benefit of its actors. The rub lies in measuring and defining the cross-cultural variables. If mutual understanding, free of value judgments, is the aim, then cross-cultural research may yield a wealth of information furthering that understanding. But if the research yields judgments such as "Mexicans tend to endure stress

passively rather than struggle actively in the manner characteristic of many Americans,"[12] then the inherent bias of such statements will truncate and impede cross-cultural understanding. Moreover such judgments simply tend to perpetuate the already existing stereo-types about other people and cultures. For at heart the componential view of culture ought to enable us to discern the componential influences acting upon individuals of a given culture rather than lead us to easy generalizations about an entire group of culture.

EXISTENTIAL APPROACH

This leads us then to a final concept of culture: the existential view in which behavior is seen not necessarily as a manifestation of a specific culture but as the Gestalt of culture interacting with forces outside the culture. For example, from this view the economic deprivation of Chicanos is not regarded as a condition inherent in Chicano culture but in the social forces in American society which create inequality of opportunity. American Blacks in this case do not gravitate towards sports because their culture stresses sports but because sports is one of the few areas of opportunity afforded them by American society. In like manner, Chicanos do not gravitate towards the garment

---

[12] W. H. Holtzman, "Cross-Cultural Research on Personality Development," Human Development, 8:65 (1965), p. 81.

industry of the Southwest because their culture encourages manual dexterity (as one El Paso businessman testified before a national commission investigating Chicano unemployment)[13] but, rather, because the garment industry is one of the few industries affording Chicanos the opportunity for work--however exploitive that industry may be of Chicanos (the Farah strike being a prime example).[14] The existential concept of culture sees man in his realities oftentimes the victim of forces beyond his control. But man is free to "choose" argue some Existentialists. Not so when the forces of existence militate against choice. A Chicano is not free to choose poverty. More often than not, Chicanos are economically impoverished because of the social forces of racism and discrimination. When equality of opportunity becomes a reality in America then Chicanos may be free to choose. And it is precisely this equality of opportunity that Chicanos are militantly striving towards.

---

[13] "The Impact of Commuter Aliens Along the Mexican and Canadian Borders," Hearings before the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration, Part I, El Paso, Texas, January 26-27, 1968. Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office.

[14] See Philip D. Ortego, "Chicanos Extend the Boycott," The Nation (November 20, 1972), pp. 497-498.

BASIC PROPOSITIONS FROM THE FOUNDATIONS OF CULTURE

In the process of detailing the most relevant historical approaches to the study of cultures and how they relate to Chicanos, we have identified some of the leading contributors to the concepts of culture and how these concepts impact upon concepts of Chicano culture. Let us turn then to some basic propositions from the foundations of culture and their implications for Chicanos.

A. Cultural Determinism

Essentially cultural determinism advances the proposition that all cultures are distinct and that its actors act in accordance with the principles underlying that culture. The most notable exponents of cultural determinism are Benjamin Lee Whorf and Edward Sapir. From their studies of American Indian tribes, they postulated that culture may be defined as what a society does and thinks. By extension, this postulation suggests that behavior is both engendered and limited by culture. In other words, one's outlook and grasp of the world is determined by the restraints imposed by one's culture. The implications of this proposition for Chicanos are that their particular behaviors may be attributed to cultural ficiencies and deficiencies,

thus in the latter view regarded as victims of their peculiar culture.

B. Assimilation--Integration--Acculturation

These three propositions are really all part of the same coin--propositions advanced by dominant cultures for the integration of minority groups into their scheme of life. In short, these propositions contend that the well-being and advancement of minority groups lies in their acceptance of dominant-group values and norms as well as assuming the overall behavior characteristics of the dominant group. But these propositions hinge upon a rhetorical turn of phrase. For most often the reality belies the philosophical stance of the words.

(1) Assimilation represents an atomistic view of cultural melioration in which minority groups give up their ethnic and racial identity in favor of the ethnic and racial identity of the dominant group. With White ethnics this may pose little problem as in the case of White European Americans who may only now retain their former ethnic identities in their names--if at all. Names like Kruschevski becomes Crews, and Rabinowitz becomes Rabin so that the ethnic origins of a person are onomastically obscured. In other words, by assimilation all the people of a culture acquire the same cultural

valence. But for "colored" Americans the process of assimilation rejects them. For in the mythical melting pot "colored" minorities sink to the bottom as unassimilated chunks unable to melt. Thus, for Chicanos assimilation has produced negligible benefits of melioration.

(2) Integration is the token effort of a dominant group to integrate its colored minorities. The process--carried out with great reluctance for the most part--resembles a large stone with other smaller stones imbedded into its surface, part of the larger stone but still identifiable as different stones simply stuck to the other. At best, integration represents a condescension on the part of the dominant group, at worst an insidious and paternal colonialism. For example, until 1962 (just 15 years ago) American Blacks could not sit at the lunch counters of certain restaurants without depredation and violent reprisals. Since then, however, Blacks may now sit at those lunch counters (though still not without some evidence of discomfort or disapproval by many whites) thanks to the public accommodation acts of the federal government. Integration is thus a kind of holding action which allows "colored" minorities only a modicum of entrée into the White social structure. In the private

sector Blacks are still considered as outsiders. The same is also true for Chicanos despite the rhetoric of high-sounding affirmative-action programs which pay only lip service to their goals.

(3) Acculturation implies the acquisition of the cultural wherewithal to get by in American society. Ethnic minorities are encouraged to learn the culture of the dominant society in order to "make it," although the hidden agenda still stresses emasculation of the culture of ethnic minorities. For Chicanos, bilingual/bicultural education is a social tactic to bring them into the American mainstream. But the emphasis is still on the superiority of the cultural values and norms of the dominant society. Nowhere is bilingual education seen as educating Chicanos, for example, in Spanish and Chinese--an equally valid emphasis of a true bilingual/bicultural educational program.

The only viable alternative seen by many Chicanos is a form of social policy which stresses the uniqueness and worth of all cultures--cultural democracy as it is sometimes called, or "cultureity." That is, where national policy avers that the American experience is the sum total of all its ethnic parts, where no one culture dominates all others.

C. Bilingualism/Biculturalism

A fairly recent cultural proposition is one articulated by Chicanos but one which looks to be already coopted by the dominant society: Bilingualism/biculturalism. In this proposition Chicanos see the possibility of retaining their distinct cultural identity while at the same time making gains towards equality of opportunity. This proposition maintains (supported by legislative, executive and judicial mandates) that Chicano children have a "right" to be educated in the language of their home or of their forebearers. That to be educated otherwise is tantamount to cultural genocide. But bilingual/bicultural programs are inappropriately administered--by Anglos more often than not in the decisive administrative positions. The aims of bilingual/bicultural education are being suoverted to the interest of the dominant group rather than the interests of Chicanos who have placed high stakes on these programs.

D. Cultural Syncretism

This proposition addresses itself to the phenomena of cultures in contact from which the contiguous or opposing cultures create a kind of cultural union synthesizing the salient features of both into a third

cultural force. Oftentimes this is simply another form of cultural cooptation. For inherent in the proposition is the evanescence of the subdominant culture.

METHODS DIRECTED TO THE STUDY OF CULTURE

As we have seen, the methods directed to the study of culture and by extension to the study of Chicano culture have been, for the most part, methods formulated from the point of view of the dominant culture. The methods have been primarily empirical, interpretive and subjective. Cultural researchers like Peter Duponceau collected data about American Indian tribes in the early 19th century. Albert Gallatin, like Duponceau, also conducted cultural studies on American Indian tribes. In the late 19th century and first half of the 20th Franz Boas developed cultural concepts using methodologies drawn from his study of Indian tribes. Unlike his predecessors, however, Boas was reluctant to frame the kinds of cultural generalizations popular in his time. Later cultural investigators like Leonard Bloomfield, Benjamin Lee Whorf, Edward Sapir and Ruth Benedict also drew heavily on their studies of native American tribes for their cultural pronouncements and propositions.

In essence, the methods of ethnographers, cultural

anthropologists and culturologists were those developed from studies of Indian tribes rather than of European ethnics. Their concepts were thus colored by their own cultural conceptions of "sub-cultural" groups. Little wonder that subsequent researchers on the trail of Chicanos drew heavily from the existing techniques and body of knowledge already extant about American Indian tribes. Chicanos have been seen simply as another tribe.

CULTURE AND SOCIETY

For many cultural researchers there is little difference between a culture and a society. To be sure, the word "society" was the precursor of the word "culture," but in more recent times definitive distinctions have been drawn between these two words. For one thing, the word "culture" has come to be identified as the apparatus for social conditioning, while "society" is seen as the configuration of social interaction; for another, culture has become the domain of anthropologists, society of sociologists. Perhaps the most important difference between culture and society lies in the view that culture is transmissible from one generation to another, while society is seen as a set of conditions not necessarily transmissible across the generations.

This means that society is seen as the aggregate of metacultural phenomena. Culture involves a symbolic process; society is not a process sui generis but a manifestation of the symbolic process. Moreover, a society may be the construct of many cultures or of intercultural dynamics and action. Thus, societies may be ideal, pastoral, industrial, technological, etc.

But more importantly, forces may arise which can topple a society and a new society constructed on the base of the old or on a new base of its own without supplanting the culture or cultures involved. For example, the Normans created a distinct society in England without supplanting the indigenous cultures which eventually overcame the Norman society although retaining some of the features of Norman society. So too, the Soviets constructed a new society on the base of the Russian empire without critical alteration of the cultural characteristics of the people. Society, then, is the product of ideation, not the ideation itself which is cultural in nature. Voting is thus a social value, not a cultural value. But a marriage ceremony may be based on cultural values, not social values. What this means for Chicanos is that they may strive for the creation of a new or altered society without having to give up their cultural identity.

SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

All cultures create social institutions. Some are ethnocultural, others sociocultural. Language for example is a social institution. The family is another. Both of these are important social institutions for Chicanos because their cultural meanings reflect the essence of Chicano life. The barrio is also a social institution reflecting the tenacity of Chicano culture.

PATTERNS OF CULTURE

The patterns of culture used by Anglo researchers to define Chicano culture have been misinterpreted at best, spurious at worst. For example, William Madsen writes:

> The Mexican-American does not suffer undue anxiety because of his propensity to sin. Instead of blaming himself for his error, he frequently attributes it to adverse circumstances. The Latin does not think he missed the bus because he arrived too late. He blames the bus for leaving before he arrived.[15]

The list of such patterns is endless. Needless to say, Chicanos have been defined by these patterns to their disadvantage. The already existing stereo-types about

---

[15]William Madsen, The Mexican-Americans of South Texas (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 16.

Chicanos are further reinforced by these expository patterns of culture. But what researchers like Madsen fail to take into account is that indeed some Mexican-Americans may blame adverse circumstances for their predilections simply because in their dire circumstances there is no one or nothing else to blame. The damage of such stealthy attributes as the "propensity to sin," create however the impression that Mexican-Americans are a promiscuous people given to pecant excesses because of easy exculpability. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Chicanos do not exhibit propensities inordinate to Anglos in the realm of sin. That they articulate different attitudes vis-à-vis social behavior is a concomitant of their culture. But in the main these attitudes are not as extreme as Madsen would have us believe.

As for the factor of missing buses, the question is one of linguistic structure and agency. A monolingual English-speaking "Latin" does not think the bus left him when he says "I missed the bus." Should he be a monolingual Spanish-speaking "Latin" or a bilingual (English and Spanish-speaking) "Latin," saying "me dejo el camion (or bus)" does not necessarily mean he is transferring "blame" to the bus in question. On the

contrary, he says "me dejo el camion (or bus)" simply because there is no other way of describing that situation in Spanish. For in Spanish (as in English) agency is sometimes objective and sometimes subjective, depending upon the syntactic structure evolved in the language. Actually, "me dejo el bus" is an elliptical construction which any Spanish speaker would understand. For unstated, is the mutally understood clarification "porque llege tarde" (because I arrived late) or "porque se fue antes de la hora" (because it left early). These are the nuances of language which are misunderstood or escape the attention of Anglo researchers who pay only superficial attention to Chicano culture.[16]

THE CHICANO PERSPECTIVE

What is needed, of course, is a Chicano perspective in the definition of Chicano culture. For Chicano culture to be really understood requires the "inside" view, bearing in mind, of course, that Chicanos do not constitute a homogeneous group any more than Anglos.

Invariably, in any discussion with novitiates to Chicano culture the questions arise: What is Chicano

---

[16]See, for example, Philip D. Ortego, "Some Cultural Implications of a Mexican-American Border Dialect of American English," Studies in Linguistics, Vol. 21, 1969-70.

culture? How is it identified? The questions beg no easy response save that the proof of Chicano culture lies in Chicanos themselves.

A. What is Chicano culture?

Like other cultures, Chicano culture is the aggregate of the shared ideation of a people seeking to improve their quality of life. Chicano culture is not an offshoot of Anglo-American culture; if anything, it is an offshoot of Mexican culture in spatial contact with Anglo-American culture. While it may reflect striking similarities to Mexican culture, it also reflects striking similarities to Anglo-American culture. Yet it is not a synthesis of both as much as it is an interactive meshing of both. Chicanos are not misplaced Mexicans, although cultural and linguistic affinity preserves a kindred spirit between them. Chicano culture is not a hybrid; it is purposive in its tenacity to develop its own cultural identity.

B. How is Chicano culture identified?

Perhaps the single most important characteristic of Chicano culture is language. Generally Chicanos are identified primarily as Spanish-speakers although great numbers of them speak English as well or are English-speakers only. Linguistically, however, Chicanos have

evolved a unique language system which employs the syntactic structures of both English and Spanish either independently or in mixed utterance now identified as "binary phenomenon."[17] The binary line has become a distinguishing element of the linguistic system of Chicanos.

Other identifiers of Chicano culture include customs and conventions which were originally Mexican in character but now greatly influenced and/or altered by environmental contact with Anglo culture. In some cases the custom or convention may be American in origin and made "Mexican" by the cultural propensity of Chicanos. The music of Chicano culture is also distinctive. The conjunto (group), for example, is an imitation of Mexican conjuntos, but Chicanos add American instrumentation and tempos to such Mexican types of music as the "corrido." There are many other items one could enumerate in identifying Chicano culture. Suffice to say, that Chicano culture is identified essentially by its mixed elements of Anglo and Mexican

---

[17]See Carl L. Rosen and Philip D. Ortego, Problems and Strategies in Teaching the Language Arts to Spanish-Speaking Mexican-American Children, U. S. Office of Education (ERIC/CRSSS) and New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico, February, 1969.

culture and English and Spanish language. For example, the American word "truck" becomes "troca" in Chicano Spanish. And the Mexican word "desmadrar" becomes dematriate" in Chicano English. Both are substantially new words being created for distinct linguistic needs.

CONCLUSION

As this essay has tried to point out, Chicanos have been ill-treated by concepts of culture derived from dominant group values and norms. The general tendency has been to regard Chicanos as Mexicans in the United States and therefore carriers or actors of Mexican culture. But cultural contact has created a distinct process of binary phenomena where Chicanos may manifest behaviors drawn from either Mexican or Anglo-American culture. The result is Chicano culture.